Remarks:

The above amendments and these remarks are responsive to the Office

action dated June 29, 2005. Prior to entry of this Amendment, claims 1-25 remained

pending in the application. Claims 1-11 and 16-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C.

§102(b) based on Bolash et al. (US 6,151,041). Claims 12-5 stand rejected under

35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on Bolash et al. variously in view of Specht

(US 5,613,625), Payne (US 6,273,661), or Sato et al. (US 5,933,164).

By this Amendment, applicants have amended claims 1, 2, 5, 9, 16, 19, 21, 23

and 24. Claims 10 and 20 have been cancelled without prejudice. In view of these

amendments, and the remarks that follow, applicants respectfully request

reconsideration of the application under 37 C.F.R. §1.111 and allowance of the

pending claims.

Rejection of Claims 1-8

As noted above, claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) based on

Bolash et al. Claim 1 is in independent form. Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1, and

thus include the subject matter of claim 1.

As amended, claim 1 recites a system for altering a function of a printing

device, the system including "first instructions loadable on the computing device in

response to the identification, by the printing device, of a first cartridge having a first

cartridge type being received in the cartridge slot, wherein the first instructions are

specific for the first cartridge type and control operation of the first cartridge when the

first cartridge is disposed in the cartridge slot of the printing device."

Bolash et al. relates to print head cartridge installation in an ink jet printer

having a plurality of print head carriers configured to accept a variety of print head

Page 9 -

AMENDMENT

Serial No. 10/631,917

HP Docket No. 200205812-1

cartridge types. According to Bolash et al., when the printer receives image data to

be printed, a processor "determines, based on the header information, which type of

print cartridge to use to print the image." (Bolash et al., col. 9, lines 19-21). The

Examiner asserts that the "header information" of Bolash et al. Is analogous to the

"first instructions" recited in claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The "header information" of Bolash et al. merely associates print image data

with a cartridge type for use in printing the image data. In other words, the "header

information" described by Bolash et al. identifies a desired cartridge type. As

amended, claim 1 recites a printing device "configured to identify the cartridge type

of the cartridge received in the cartridge slot."

Furthermore, the "first instructions" recited in claim 1 are loadable in response

to the identification of the cartridge type of the received cartridge, and control

operation of the received cartridge. The "header information" of Bolash et al. is not

loadable in response to identification of the cartridge type, and does not control

operation of the received cartridge. The "header information" thus cannot properly

be characterized as the first instructions recited in claim 1. Accordingly, Bolash et al.

fails to disclose or suggest every feature of claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reason, claim 1 is allowable over Bolash et al., and

the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) based on Bolash et al. should be

withdrawn. Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1, and are allowable for at least the same

reasons as claim 1.

Additionally, claim 3 specifies that "the first instructions are non-specific to the

printing device" and that the system further includes "a printing device driver

configured to translate cartridge-specific instructions to printing-device-interpretable

Page 10 -

AMENDMENT

Serial No. 10/631,917

HP Docket No. 200205812-1

instructions." Although Bolash et al. teaches a printer processor that accesses the

printer memory to retrieve "operating parameters" necessary to configure the printer

to print. (Bolash et al., col. 9, line 67), such "operating parameters" are quite different

from the "first instructions" of claim 3. The operating parameters of Bolash et al.

reside within the printer, and therefore are specific to the printing device.

Moreover, Bolash et al. falls to teach a printer device driver that is configured

to translate cartridge-specific instructions to printing-device-interpretable instructions.

In fact, there is no need to do so as Bolash et al. proposes a system wherein a

desired cartridge type is sought. Claim 3 thus also is allowable for these reasons.

Claim 7 recites a system "wherein the first instructions are configured to

provide user-selectable options regarding the use of the first cartridge type." Bolash

et al. describes, in the passage cited by the Examiner, a printer processor that

"generates an error message indicating that the appropriate print head cartridge

could not be located among the installed cartridges." (Bolash et al., col. 10, lines 7-9)

Bolash et al. further teaches that "[t]he error message further instructs the user to

install the appropriate type of printer cartridge to continue the operation." (Bolash et

al., col. 10, lines 9-11) No user-selectable codes are noted. Accordingly, claim 7

also is allowable for these reasons.

Rejection of Claims 9-15

Claims 9-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Bolash et al. Claim

12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Bolash et al. in view of

Specht. Claims 13-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Bolash et

al. in view of Payne. Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on

Bolash et al. in view of Sato et al.

Page 11 - AMI

AMENDMENT

Serial No. 10/631,917

HP Docket No. 200205812-1

By this amendment, claim 9 has been amended to incorporate features

previously recited in claim 10, and claim 10 has been cancelled without prejudice.

Claim 9 now recites a printer including "...instructions specific to each of the different

cartridge types, the instructions being adapted to control operation of the cartridge

and being loadable in response to the identification, by the printer, of the cartridge

type...."

As discussed generally above, Bolash et al. fails to disclose or suggest

instructions "adapted to control operation of the cartridge" that are "loadable in

response to the identification, by the printer, of the cartridge type," as recited in

amended claim 9. Specht, Payne and Sato et al. add nothing in this regard. For at

least the foregoing reasons, the rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) based

on Bolash et al. should be withdrawn. Claims 11-15 depend from claim 9, and are

allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 9.

Rejection of Claims 16-18

Claims 16-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Bolash et al. As

amended, claim 16 recites a method of changing the function of a printing device

including "identifying the cartridge type of a respective one of the first cartridge and

the second cartridge inserted in the cartridge slot" and "responsive to identifying the

cartridge type, receiving cartridge-operation instructions specific to operation of a

respective one of the first cartridge and the second cartridge inserted in the cartridge

slot."

Bolash et al. fails to disclose or suggest including "identifying the cartridge

type of a respective one of the first cartridge and the second cartridge inserted in the

cartridge slot." At best, Bolash et al. describes determining the location of a desired

Page 12 -

AMENDMENT

Serial No. 10/631,917

HP Docket No. 200205812-1

type of print head. Bolash also fails to disclose or suggest "responsive to identifying

the cartridge type, receiving cartridge-operation instructions specific to operation of a

respective one of the first cartridge and the second cartridge inserted in the cartridge

slot." For at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

based on Bolash et al. must be withdrawn. Claims 17-18 depend from claim 16, and

are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 16.

Rejection of Claims 19-22

Claims 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Bolash et al. Claim

19 now recites a program storage device readable by a machine tangibly embodying

a program of commands including commands executable by the machine to "identify,

from a plurality of different cartridge types, a cartridge type of a cartridge operably

disposed in a printing device as being configured to produce a desired specialty

effect" and to "load instructions specific to the cartridge type."

Bolash et al. fails to disclose or suggest commands to identify, from a plurality

of different cartridge types, the cartridge type of a cartridge disposed in the printing

device which is configured to produce a desired specialty effect. Bolash et al. only

considers determining location of known cartridge types. Moreover, Bolash et al.

does not disclose or suggest commands to load instructions specific to the cartridge

type. In fact, Bolash et al. does not even consider the potential for such cartridge-

specific instructions. For at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 19 under 35

U.S.C. §102(b) based on Bolash et al. should be withdrawn. Claims 21-22 depend

from claim 19, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 19.

Page 13 -

AMENDMENT

Serial No. 10/631,917

HP Docket No. 200205812-1

Rejection of Claim 23

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Bolash et al. As

amended, claim 23 recites a printing device adapted to produce a plurality of effects,

the printing device including "means for identifying the cartridge type of the cartridge

operably disposed within the slot" and "means for programming the printing device to

operate any of the plurality of different cartridge types when operably disposed within

the slot."

Bolash et al. falls to disclose or suggest means for identifying the cartridge

type of the cartridge operably disposed within the slot, and fails to disclose or

suggest means for programming the printing device to operate any of the plurality of

different cartridge types when operably disposed within the slot. For at least these

reasons, the rejection of claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) based on Bolash et al.

should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claim 24-25

Claims 24 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) based on Bolash et

al. As amended, claim 24 recites a kit for a printing system, the kit including "an

accessory cartridge having a cartridge type selected from a plurality of different

cartridge types and configured to be positioned within a universal cartridge slot in the

printing device, the accessory cartridge configured to communicate the cartridge

type to the printing system and to generate a specialty effect" and "instructions

loadable on the computing device and operable by the processor, upon identification

of the cartridge type, the instructions being specific to the type of the accessory

cartridge."

Page 14 -

AMENDMENT

Serial No. 10/631,917

HP Docket No. 200205812-1

Bolash et al. fails to disclose or suggest instructions loadable on the computing device and operable by the processor, upon identification of the cartridge type, the instructions being specific to the type of the accessory cartridge. In fact, there is no loading of instructions specific to an identified type of cartridge disclosed by Bolash et al. For at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) based on Bolash et al. should be withdrawn. Claim 25 depends from claim 24, and is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 24.

Applicants believe that this application is now in condition for allowance, in view of the above amendments and remarks. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner issue a Notice of Allowability covering the pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions, or if a telephone interview would in any way advance prosecution of the application, please contact the undersigned attorney of record.

Respectfully submitted.

KOLISCH HARTWELL, P.C.

Walter W. Karnstein Registration No. 35,565

520 S.W. Yamhill Street, Suite 200

Portland, Oregon 97204 Telephone: (503) 224-6655 Facsimile: (503) 295-6679 Attorney for Applicants

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to Examiner A. Do, Group Art Unit 2853, Assistant Commissioner for Patents, at facsimile number (703) 872-9306 on September 29, 2005.

Christie A. Doolittle

Page 15 - AMENDMENT

Serial No. 10/631,917

HP Docket No. 200205812-1 KH Docket No. HPCB 352